

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES AG and  
EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

COREVALVE, INC. and  
MEDTRONIC COREVALVE, LLC

Defendants.

C.A. No. 08-091-GMS

**VERDICT FORM**

We, the jury, having duly deliberated on the evidence presented by the parties,  
answer the interrogatories posed by the Court as follows:

**I. PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

**QUESTION 1:**

Has Edwards proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the CoreValve Generation 3 ReValving System literally infringes Claim 1 of the '552 Patent?

YES   ✓   (for Edwards)      NO                      (for CoreValve)

**If you answered “yes” to Question 1, go to Question 3.**

**If you answered “no” to Question 1, go to Question 2.**

**QUESTION 2:**

Has Edwards proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the CoreValve Generation 3 ReValving System infringes Claim 1 of the '552 Patent under the Doctrine of Equivalents?

YES                      (for Edwards)      NO                      (for CoreValve)

**If you answered “yes” to Question 2, go to Question 3.**

**If you answered “no” to both Questions 1 and 2, go to Question 4.**

## II. WILLFUL PATENT INFRINGEMENT

### QUESTION 3:

Has Edwards proven by clear and convincing evidence that CoreValve's infringement of Claim 1 of the '552 Patent was willful?

YES ✓ (for Edwards)      NO \_\_\_\_\_ (for CoreValve)

**Please go to Question 4.**

### III. PATENT VALIDITY

#### QUESTION 4:

Has CoreValve proven by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 1 of the '552 Patent is invalid because it is not enabled?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ (for CoreValve)

NO ✓ \_\_\_\_\_ (for Edwards)

**Please go to Question 5.**

#### **IV. EDWARDS' DAMAGES**

**If you found that CoreValve has infringed Claim 1 of the '552 Patent (either literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents), and that CoreValve did not prove that Claim 1 of the '552 Patent is invalid, you must decide the amount of damages adequate to compensate Edwards for CoreValve's infringement.**

##### **QUESTION 5:**

If you believe that Edwards has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to lost profits for a portion of CoreValve's infringing sales, please enter the amount of lost profits:

Answer: \$ 72,645,555.00

##### **QUESTION 6:**

For those CoreValve infringing sales for which you did not award Edwards lost profits, what is the amount of reasonable royalty to which Edwards is entitled?

Answer: \$ 1,284,861.00

Dated: April 1, 2010

Foreperson **¶**